



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,387	12/17/2003	Julio F. Rodrigues	T&B 1755	7246
45740	7590	08/27/2007	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN & BARON, LLP 6900 JERICHO TURNPIKE SYOSSET, NY 11791			LEON, EDWIN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/738,387	RODRIGUES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Edwin A. León	2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on June 13, 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment filed June 13, 2007 in which Claim 17 has been amended, has been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ming-Hwa (U.S. Patent No. 5,024,606). With regard to Claim 1, Ming-Hwa discloses a connector for terminating a coaxial cable (40) comprising: a generally cylindrical connector body (20) having a detent (22) disposed therein; and a generally cylindrical locking sleeve (13) coupled to the connector body (20) and having at least one protrusion (16) formed thereon partially encircling less than the full circumference of the locking sleeve (13) and for being received in the detent (22) when the coaxial cable (40) is terminated in the connector . See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 2, Ming-Hwa discloses the locking sleeve (13) being detachably coupled to the connector body (20). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 3, Ming-Hwa discloses the locking sleeve (13) being movable from a first position loosely retaining the cable (40) in the connector body (20) to a second position (Fig. 6) locking the cable (40) to the connector body (20). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 4, Ming-Hwa discloses the detent (22) being annular. See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 5, Ming-Hwa discloses the locking sleeve (13) including a plurality of protrusions (16) formed thereon and being evenly spaced about the locking sleeve (13). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 6, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) including a chamfered front wall (shown in Fig. 2) for easing insertion into the detent (22). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 7, Ming-Hwa discloses the detent (22) including a rearwardly facing chamfered wall (shown in Fig. 2) that is complementary to the chamfered front wall (shown in Fig. 2) of the at least one protrusion (16). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 8, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) is of greater malleable composition than the connector body (20). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 9, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) including a perpendicular rear wall (shown in Fig. 2). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 10, Ming-Hwa discloses the detent (22) including a forwardly facing perpendicular wall (shown in Fig. 2) for abutting the perpendicular rear wall (shown in Fig. 2) of the at least one protrusion (16) and preventing extraction of the at least one protrusion (16) from the detent (22). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 11, Ming-Hwa discloses a connector for terminating a coaxial cable (40) comprising: a connector body (20) having an annular detent (22) disposed therein; and a locking sleeve (13) detachably coupled to the connector body (20) having a plurality of protrusions (16), spaced circumferentially and evenly formed thereon and for being received in the detent (22) when the coaxial cable (40) is terminated in the connector. See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 12, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) including a chamfered front wall (shown in Fig. 2) for easing insertion into the detent (22). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 13, Ming-Hwa discloses the detent (22) including a rearwardly facing chamfered wall (shown in Fig. 2) that is complementary to the chamfered front wall (shown in Fig. 2) of the at least one protrusion (16). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 14, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) including a perpendicular rear wall (shown in Fig. 2). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 15, Ming-Hwa discloses the detent (22) including a forwardly facing perpendicular wall (shown in Fig. 2) for abutting the perpendicular rear wall (shown in Fig. 2) of the at least one protrusion (16) and preventing extraction of the at least one protrusion (16) from the detent (22). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 16, Ming-Hwa discloses the at least one protrusion (16) being of greater malleable composition than the connector body (20). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 17, Ming-Hwa discloses a connector for terminating a coaxial cable (40) comprising: a connector body (combination of 13 and 30) having a cable receiving end (shown in Fig. 2) and a projection (16) disposed therein, a locking sleeve (20) insertably received through the cable receiving end (shown in Fig. 2) of the connector body (combination of 13 and 30) and having a rearward end (shown in Fig. 2), a smooth annular portion (24) and at least one groove (22) formed between the rearward end (shown in Fig. 2) and the smooth annular portion (24); and wherein the projection (16) slides along the smooth annular portion (24) and is subsequently received in the groove (22) when the coaxial cable (40) is terminated in the connector body (combination of 13 and 30). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 18, Ming-Hwa discloses the locking sleeve (20) having a first position and a second position (Fig. 6). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 19, Ming-Hwa discloses the projection (16) sliding along the smooth annular portion (24) and is subsequently received in the groove (22) when the locking sleeve (20) is moved to the second position (Fig. 6) for securing the locking sleeve (20) to the connector body (combination of 13 and 30). See Figs. 1-6.

With regard to Claim 20, Ming-Hwa discloses the projection (16) being an O-ring. See Figs. 1-6.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed June 13, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's arguments regarding Claims 1 and 11, that the Ming-Hwa reference doesn't show the sleeve having at least one protrusion encircling less than full circumference of the locking sleeve, Applicant's attention is directed to Figs. 1-2 in which the Ming-Hwa reference clearly discloses the sleeve (13) having at least one protrusion (16) encircling less than full circumference of the locking sleeve. Applicant is reminded that grooves (14') as shown in Fig. 1 precludes the protrusion from being a full circle. Applicant is also reminded that Column 3, Lines 6-15 of the Ming-Hwa reference states that the protrusions (16) are formed on each clamping section (14) and separated by slots or grooves (14). It is noted that feature 14' is not mentioned in Ming-Hwa's specification, but a closer look at the reference shows that the features described as slots 14 in Column 3, Line 9, are suppose to be features 14'. Specifically, Ming-Hwa discloses features 14 as being clamping plates or sections through out all the specification and not a slot. Then, it is not possible for separate protrusions (16) to cover a full circumference since the grooves (14') would represent parts that would actually split the circumference. Therefore, it is the Examiner's opinion that the Ming-Hwa reference would meet Applicant's claims in their broadest interpretation.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding Claim 17, that the Ming-Hwa reference doesn't show the locking sleeve insertably received through the cable receiving end of the connector body, Applicant's attention is directed to Fig. 6 in which Ming-Hwa clearly discloses the locking sleeve (20) insertably received through the cable receiving end (shown in Fig. 2) of the connector body (combination of 13 and 30). The combination of 13 and 30 can be considered the connector body since the claims do not call for the connector body to be a one piece body. Furthermore, Ming-Hwa shows (in Fig. 2) the cable receiving end of 13 which is part of the connector body, as defined by the Examiner, and receives the locking sleeve 20 as shown in Fig. 6. Therefore, it is the Examiner's opinion that the Ming-Hwa reference would meet Applicant's claims in their broadest interpretation.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin A. León whose telephone number is (571) 272-2008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on 571-272-2800, extension 33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edwin A. Leon/
AU 2833